

### REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Action dated February 12, 2007, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 15, 16, and 22 are amended, claims 3, 4, and 23-30 are canceled, and claims 31-40 are newly added in this application. Claims 1, 2, 5-22, and 31-40 remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action, the drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The specification is objected to for formalities. Claims 15 and 22 are rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 1, 2, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,457,282 to Jorgensen (hereinafter "Jorgensen"). Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jorgensen. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jorgensen in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,547,343 to Jane (hereinafter "Jane"). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jorgensen in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,917,940 to Duddy (hereinafter "Duddy"). Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jorgensen in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,370,500 to Thompson (hereinafter "Thompson"). Claims 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jorgensen in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,256,039 to Crawford (hereinafter "Crawford"). Claims 2, 8, 9, 11, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jorgensen in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,725,356 to Carter (hereinafter "Carter"). Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jorgensen in view of Carter and further in view of Duddy. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jorgensen in view of Carter and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,842,670 to Nigoghosian (hereinafter "Nigoghosian"). Claims 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jorgensen in view of Carter and Crawford.

The objection to the drawings is now moot as claims 3 and 4 have been canceled. The amendments to claims 15 and 22 make the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph moot. The Abstract has been amended. Further, Applicants decline to amend paragraph 0016 as suggested because Applicants believe it is correct as written.


Application No.: 10/724,412  
Amdt. dated May 14, 2007  
Reply to Office Action dated February 12, 2007

Docket No.: ELTON-01

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (443) 441-3302 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 14, 2007

By   
**Eric J. Nuss**  
Registration No. 40,106  
7980 Drumbeat Place  
Jessup, MD 20794  
(443) 421-3302  
Attorney for Applicant

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage a first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on May 14, 2007.